

## AESCHYLEAN TRAGEDY, RELIGION AND *HEUREMATA*: PROMETHEUS AND PALAMEDES\*

JOSÉ ANTONIO CLÚA SERENA  
University of Lleida

*In Memory of Martin L. West*

§1.- The Greeks had an enduring fascination with “firsts” (*heuremata*). Aeschylus, the dramatist who witnessed the establishment of democracy at Athens and fought against the Persians at Marathon, wrote a *Palamedes* and a *Prometheus*. Aeschylus, “a prophet of the New Era”, according to E. R. Dodds<sup>1</sup>, is another “link” of the process that appeared in the 6th and 5th centuries BC towards Monotheism or Henotheism (...). We must not forget that also Aeschylus considers Zeus as an instrument of justice<sup>2</sup>, and Prometheus (and Palamedes) claimed to be the creators of some inventions. The purpose of this paper is to make new suggestions regarding the motif of *heuremata* in the Aeschylus’ *Palamedes* and *Prometheus*, well known in the Antiquity. According to E. D. Phillips<sup>3</sup>, Palamedes is the representative in front of Troy, due to his inventions (*heuremata*), of the achievements of the Minoan tradition, inherited afterwards by the Mycenaean. The legend changed Palamedes from a simple transmitter of the art of writing into its inventor. He gained hatred from the Greek officers (Mycenaeans) because to know how to write was seen badly by them. M. Delcourt<sup>4</sup> thinks that Palamedes was a titan turned epic hero. His inventions are ill-fated due to his own condition. Palamedes, Philoctetes and Ajax were known as old *daimones*, but upon being inserted in the

---

\* This paper has been made within the project FFI2014-26405 of the “Grupo de investigación” directed by prof. Esteban Calderón Dorda (University of Murcia), “Studies on Religious Vocabulary in Ancient Greece”, financed by the Secretaría de Estado de Educación, Universidades, Investigación y Desarrollo. (Spain). An abridged version of this paper was presented at a meeting of the 8th Congress of the SEEC, at Reus, on 23-25 April 1985 (see *El teatro grec i romà*, Barcelona, 1986, pp. 179-189). I am most grateful to the comments and criticisms of the participants in the Congress, especially Josep Alsina, and also of the editors of these Conference proceedings.

<sup>1</sup> See Dodds 1994 60, n. 1 and Calderón 2013 300.

<sup>2</sup> See Lloyd-Jones 1971 and Grube, 1970.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Phillips 1957: 267-278, based on Graves 1967: 162, and Bérard 1953: 65-83.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Delcourt 1965: 209-242, who partly follows the studies of Wilamowitz 1914: 146 and Preller-Robert 1921, II: 1127.

*epos* they lost their characteristics and became covered in psychological values. Only Palamedes maintained Prometheus' traits.

§2.- If in Aeschylus's theatre Palamedes and Prometheus both claimed to be the creators of the same inventions, we must therefore think that the only possible answer is that Aeschylus incarnated "the passage from one conception to another". From Aeschylus onwards, in the later mythographical tradition, it is possible to believe that the same invention could be indifferently attributed to both characters. Another evident example corroborates our statement, namely the fact that both Prometheus and Palamedes have been the object of oratory pieces in the way of an apology by Lucian and Gorgias respectively."

We know that besides Euripides' *Palamedes*,<sup>5</sup> other tragic writers like Aeschylus, Sophocles and Astidamas wrote works entitled *Palamedes*, that Sophocles wrote two other pieces, the *Nauplios Katapleon* and the *Nauplios Pyrkaeus* (fr. 392-405 Nauck<sup>2</sup> = 425-438 Radt), while Astidamas, Lycophron and Philocles each wrote a *Nauplios*. All of these pieces made reference to Palamedes. The main theme of these *Palamedes* became more ingenious and transformed in many points in comparison with the simplicity of the epic treatment of the myth<sup>6</sup>.

Although it is true that Palamedes and the titan who was the friend of men are portrayed as ingenious inventors in Aeschylus, we must ask ourselves, on the basis of the short fragments that have survived to date, what is the mythical role that both characters develop in Aeschylus' tragedy and what possible connotations they had with the "Idea of progress"<sup>7</sup>. We must therefore distinguish their own personal and exclusive 'mythemes'<sup>8</sup>, without forgetting that one can only emit prudent and hypothetical suppositions, because we rely on the analysis of just two fragments transmitted by the tradition in the case of Aeschylus' *Palamedes*, that is<sup>9</sup>, fr.180 N<sup>2</sup> and 182 N<sup>2</sup> (= 181-\*182<sup>a</sup> Radt), although they are compared with Aeschylus' *Prometheus*. Certainly, the argument of Aeschylus' Palamedes according to R. Scodel is as follows (quoting from L. Romero Mariscal's abstract):

"El argumento del *Palamedes* de Esquilo (fr. 181-182 Nauck<sup>2</sup> = 181-\*182<sup>a</sup> Radt) era el recogido en el escolio al v. 432 del *Orestes* de Eurípides. Odiseo, Diomedes y

---

<sup>5</sup> See Romero 2007.

<sup>6</sup> The sequence of these plays, in terms of mythical chronology, is *Palamedes*, *Nauplios katapleon*, *Aias Lokros*, *Nauplios Pyrkaeus*. Cf. Sommerstein and Talbot (eds.) 2012 or Sommerstein 2008, and *Idem* 2010.

<sup>7</sup> On Aeschylus' tragedy, see Libran 2005: 23-64.

<sup>8</sup> Or "mythèmes" (in French), that is, each of a set of fundamental generic units of narrative structure in structuralist anthropology and literary criticism.

<sup>9</sup> We will not mention fr. 181 N<sup>2</sup> (= 181 Radt), because it refers to when Palamedes' father Nauplius, a deified mariner, asks the Achaean army for an explanation for the death of his son.

Agamenón trama la muerte de Palamedes mediante el engaño del oro escondido en la tienda del héroe y la falsa carta del frigio en la que se hace a Palamedes traidor al campamento griego y aliado de los troyanos. El sabio se defiende ante la acusación de traición pero el ejército cree que la carta y el oro prueban su culpabilidad y Palamedes es lapidado. Su padre Nauplio se presenta en el campamento y exige una reparación por la injusta muerte de su hijo”.

In the book of *Eclogues* “*Peri arithmetikes*” Stobaeus<sup>10</sup> mentions some verses which come from Aeschylus’ *Prometheus* (vv. 454-459), that belong to the titan’s famous discourse and are often cited with regard to the consideration of Prometheus as the Sophistic representative<sup>11</sup> *avant la lettre* of the “Idea of progress”. Nevertheless, Stobaeus makes a mistake when, after these verses, he adds four other verses which do not belong to Aeschylus’ *Prometheus*, and which constitute fr. 470 *adesp.*

Critical literature<sup>12</sup> has almost unanimously attributed them to Aeschylus’ *Palamedes*, in spite of being aware of the strong analogies with fr. 182 N<sup>2</sup> (= fr 182 Radt), that belongs to this same piece and which explains other similar inventions to that of fr. 470 *adesp.* Furthermore, the scholiast of Aeschylus’ *Prometheus*, when referring to the inventions of this titan, writes (ad. v.457): τούτων τὴν εὔρεσιν καὶ Παλαμήδῃ προσήψεν. That is to say, the inventions mentioned within could also be attributed to Aeschylus’ *Palamedes*<sup>13</sup>. Stobaeus’ error proves without doubt that in Aeschylus’ tragedies, Prometheus and Palamedes had many common traits with regard to their inventive nature.

The question of the possible inclusion of *Palamedes* inside a trilogy, which has been accurately dealt with by F.G. Welcker, O. Jahn and T. Zielinski<sup>14</sup> will not be a matter for our analysis, neither will the hypothetical reconstruction of its argumentative traits, which have recently been studied by F. Stoessl<sup>15</sup>. Nevertheless, as Alan H. Sommerstein argues on this play, “no convincing attempt has been made to place *Palamedes* in a connected trilogy”<sup>16</sup>.

The mythical nature of Palamedes is well-known in the double sense of an “epic hero” who, on the one hand, is badly anchored in the epic cycle because he only demonstrated his grandeur in front of Troy with his innocent death, in contrast with the rest of the heroes who demonstrate their magnificence through their deeds, and on the other, because he was the proverbial inventor of the Greek people, a he-

---

<sup>10</sup> Wachsmuth 1958: 15.

<sup>11</sup> See Durán López 2011.

<sup>12</sup> Wilamowitz 1935: 200; Nestle 1940: 330, Mette 1959: 108 or Szarmach 1974: 196.

<sup>13</sup> See Lucas de Dios 2008.

<sup>14</sup> Zielinski 1925: 250; Welcker 1839: 2 ff.; Jahn 1836: 5 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Stoessl 1966: 93.

<sup>16</sup> Sommerstein 2000: 118-127 (*esp.* 121).

ro who spread culture, especially from the lyrics onwards, as we have analysed in another paper<sup>17</sup>. Therefore, besides his inventing and benefactor nature – for instance the invention of the alphabet, measures, weights, and numbers, of games of chance and astrology, etc. –, Palamedes became a pacifist warrior, a true sophist. Literarily speaking, we find him documented for the first time in the *Cypria*, and later on in the archaic lyrics, the sophists, the philosophers, the three great tragedy and comedy writers, and even in the Second Sophistic movement.

§3.- A. H. Sommerstein<sup>18</sup> suggests that POxy 2253 can be identified as the opening of the prologue of Aeschylus' *Palamedes* and he explains the aim of his paper about a play which is very little known: "The unknown devotee of Aeschylus who lived at Oxyrhynchus around AD 200, and whose library has added so much to our knowledge of the dramatist's work, also inadvertently left a number of puzzles behind him. This paper attempts to solve one of these, and to explore the implications of the solution for a play about which is generally thought that very little is known". But Sommerstein suggests that POxy 2253 is clearly the opening of the prologue of a Trojan War play. We reproduce here the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2253 (Aeschylus fr. 223a Mette = 451k Radt), and the translation of A. H. Sommerstein:

Διὸς μ]ὲν εὐχαις πρῶτα πρεσβέων σέβ[ας  
X --- ἰκνοῦμαι φέγγ[ος] ἡλίου τὸ νῦν  
X --- ἀμειψαί [ξ]ὸν τύχαις εὐημέ[ρ]οις  
X --- υ --- X Ἑλλάδος λοχαγέταις,  
οἱ ξὺν Με]νέλεω τὴν βίαιον ἀρπαγὴν  
γυναικὸς ἐκ]πράσσουσι Πρ[ι]αμ[ί]δην Πάριον,  
X --- υ --- X ]ς εὐμενῇ συνα[λ]λ[α]γήν.

Honouring first in my prayers the awesome majesty of Zeus [...]  
I beseech him that this present light of the sun may change [...]  
with a good day's fortune [...] for the captains of Greece, [who together  
with Me]nelaos are seeking revenge from Paris son of Priam for the violent  
seizure [of his wife,] a friendly reconciliation [? of their grievous quarrel].

As A. H. Sommerstein<sup>19</sup> suggests about the knowledge of the *Palamedes* and the arguments for its ascription to this piece, "our direct knowledge (of Aeschylus' *Palamedes*) comes from three "book" fragments –only one of which is explicitly ascribed to *Palamedes* – and one other reference. Three of these four pieces of evi-

---

<sup>17</sup> Clúa 1985: 69-93.

<sup>18</sup> Sommerstein 2000.

<sup>19</sup> Sommerstein 2000: 121.

dence (fr. 181a, 182, 182a) seem all to relate to one and the same speech by Palamedes himself, in which he recounted, in language closely imitated decades later by the author of *Prometheus Bound*, his services to the Greek army and to humanity generally (invention of arithmetic, organization of the army in brigades and companies, fixing of mealtimes, possibly discovery of the astronomical season calendar), most likely in defending himself against an accusation<sup>20</sup>. Among other arguments, we think that the expression Ἑλλάδος λοχαγέταις, in this Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, reminds us of the use of this word by Aeschylus.

Furthermore, Aeschylus' myth of Prometheus is very different from Hesiod's myth and is apparently closer to that of Protagoras because, according to this sophist, Prometheus offers men the *technical ability* as well as fire, which is an evident novelty with regard to the previous versions of the legend. In Aeschylus we are told that men have only received benefits from Prometheus, and rather than the misfortune which appears in Hesiod. In spite of the fact that fire is not actually mentioned amongst his inventions, nonetheless all the inventions which appear in Aeschylus' *Prometheus* are characteristic traits of intellectual progress, they are inventions of a certain cultural level, and this quality was undoubtedly shared with Palamedes<sup>20</sup>. In accordance with what we have argued in our Introduction to the translation into Spanish of Aeschylus' *Prometheus*<sup>21</sup>:

“La transmisión de este saber se corresponde con la falsa etimología que explicaba el nombre *Prometheús* derivándolo de *pró-mantháno*, es decir, «aquel que sabe de antemano»<sup>30</sup>, y oponiéndolo a su hermano *Epimetheús*, que sería, por tanto, «aquel que se entera después», o lo que es lo mismo, «aquel que no prevé un peligro», sin duda en alusión a su matrimonio con Pandora. En realidad, es más interesante su auténtico origen, que sin duda corresponde a la raíz sánscrita *para-math*, «mover con violencia» y de ahí «robar», y debe relacionarse con *pramantha*, que designa, junto con el *arani*, a uno de los palos utilizados antiguamente por los brahmanes para encender el fuego, y cuyo significado místico es la voluntad humana, incesantemente activo”.

§4.- However, before delving deeper into the comparison of these two myths, we must make reference to the problem surrounding Aeschylus' *Prometheus*.<sup>22</sup> For the last century the date, authenticity, structure and global meaning of Aeschylus' *Prometheus* has been placed in doubt and not thoughtlessly. It presently seems to be accepted by everyone, especially thanks to the work of W. Schmid,

---

<sup>20</sup> With regard to the history of the myth of Prometheus we base our theories on Kérenyi 1946 or García Gual 1979.

<sup>21</sup> Clúa - R.J. Montañés 2013: 36.

<sup>22</sup> Longo 1961-1962: 249-252. On Aeschylus' notion of human progress, see Thomson 1946, or Dodds 1973. On the myth of Prometheus, Séchan 1951, Kérenyi 1946 or *Idem* 1997, Duchemin 1974, Charachidzé 1986, Trousson 2001 or Griffith 1983.

that Aeschylus' *Prometheus* shows a closer tie with Sophocles' technique than with any other piece Aeschylus wrote, that is, that Prometheus is the simplest piece with the clearest style out of Aeschylus' *corpus*, and that maybe it is a work by another author, or was finished by Euphorion, Aeschylus' son<sup>23</sup>.

With regard to the possible testimony of Prometheus about the existence of the sophist movement and its radicalism in the middle of the fifth century in Athens, which is proposed by W. Schmid<sup>24</sup>, we must say that there has, to our understanding, been two important milestones in the resolution of this problem: on the one hand, that defended by most authors, according to which Prometheus offers Humanity the service of creating the civilization's arts. With regard to this gift, E. R. Dodds<sup>25</sup> has observed that these are not technological inventions but Prometheus' intellectual consecutions (astronomy, arithmetic, medicine, fortune telling, etc.); on the one hand, and as a milestone, we must mention the valuable contribution by W. den Boer<sup>26</sup>, who, in comparing Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* with the *Old Testament*, reaches the conclusion that the titan Prometheus teaches man, but that this does not represent one of man's progresses, because a pessimistic and futile tone flourishes all over the work in any progress that does not obey Zeus. Therefore, this pessimism makes W. den Boer state that Prometheus does not represent a defence of human progress.

The key word of the "idea of progress" in ancient Greece was "invention" (εὑρεσις), and this progress was itself conceived in quantitative terms, that is, additive terms, which were a result of many contributions from the gods, the "cultural heroes" or from their "needs". Faced with this "Aufklärung", born in the Pericles' period, which was taken on by intellectuals such as Sophocles or Herodotus<sup>27</sup>, and which has its *akme* in Sophistic Movement, we must ask ourselves where we should place Aeschylus and which concept or heroic "Weltanschauung" of πρῶτος εὑρετής or "first inventor" is demonstrated in his tragedies *Prometheus* or *Palamedes*?

---

<sup>23</sup> We are citing in accordance with Dodds 1973: 26-44.

<sup>24</sup> Schmid 1929.

<sup>25</sup> Schmid 1929: 32. Dodds reproach arises from the affirmation by Schoemann, according to which Prometheus had only invented "technology", "...a nasty thing which does people harm by making them rich and materialistic".

<sup>26</sup> Boer 1977.

<sup>27</sup> Neither Sophocles nor Herodotus were true "enlightened humanists", as it has been stated on so many occasions. In spite of their open praises of human knowledge, they were fully aware that that knowledge brought about destruction (Sophocles) and that human prosperity is unstable (Herodotus). With regard to "anthropological theories of progress" we must mention the work by Guthrie 1971, as well as the work by Edelstein 1967. The articles gathered by Dodds 1973 and by Mondolfo 1955: 509-607, are also very suggestive. An important achievement in this sense is the specific contribution of Boer 1977.

In fact, we need only take a look at the chapter “Ursprung der Heuremata kataloge”, of the doctoral thesis by A. Kleingünther, entitled Πρώτος εὐρετής. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung*<sup>28</sup>, to see the development of the main milestones in the Greek treatment of the *heurémata*.

If we now descend into Attic tragedy and specifically into Euripides’ tragedy, we can see that while Sophocles deals with the πρώτος εὐρετής, which are significant in drama for their events, Euripides uses them in another sense. Although he sometimes mentions *heuremata*, he does not always do so at the first chance, and instead affords priority to *heuremata* and *heuretai* from Attica. But, what about Aeschylus?

E. Calderón<sup>29</sup> argues about Aeschylus’ *Prometheus* and his characteristic trait as πρώτος εὐρετής and his benefits:

“En Atenas el culto a Prometeo gozaba de particular favor y a éste se le dedicaban unas importantes fiestas, las Prometeas, en las que se conmemoraba la entrega del fuego a los hombres, recuerdo del proceso civilizador. Por lo tanto, este culto celebraba entre los atenienses la imagen de Prometeo como benefactor de la Humanidad, compitiendo con Atenea en los numerosos beneficios otorgados en calidad de διδάσκαλος o de πρώτος εὐρετής, pues no conviene olvidar que las diversas τέχναι enseñadas por aquél a los hombres libraban a éstos de las contrariedades y contratiempos provocadas por la naturaleza, y que la invención de las τέχναι y el nacimiento del pensamiento racional están íntimamente ligados”.

Besides this, A. Kleingünther<sup>30</sup>, and other critics before him, has postulated that a good number of the examples of inventions contained in Aeschylus’ *Prometheus* had already been mentioned in his *Palamedes*, while at the same time he chose inventions by other gods and especially by Palamedes. It is true that he chose some of them. The most specific case is that of the invention of military tactics, which was not really appropriate for a titan such as Prometheus, especially if we take into account that Prometheus was the benefactor of the whole of Humanity, while Palamedes was, in turn, the particular benefactor of the Greeks, as the study of fragment 470 *adesp.* lets us see. Having reached this point, we can try to delineate, in a schematic way, the distinctive traits of Palamedes and Prometheus, cultured heroes or titans/ gods, as well as mention their common characteristic traits:

---

<sup>28</sup> Gotinga 1933: 143 and ff.

<sup>29</sup> Calderón 2015: XXXIV and García López 1975.

<sup>30</sup> Kleingünther 1933: 82.

**PROMETHEUS (Aeschylus)**

- α) Very general inventions
- β) Referred to as “god” or “titan”.
- γ) Divine knowledge.
- δ) Zeus’ punishment for having betrayed the gods (stealing of fire and giving of technical ability)
- ε) Benefactor of the whole of Humanity

**PALAMEDES (Aeschylus)**

- α) Very specialised inventions
- β) Human knowledge. Referred to as “hero”.
- γ) Punishment by man for having betrayed men (affairs of Troy and Ulysses’ hatred)
- δ) Only a benefactor of the Greek peoples

**COMMON CHARACTERISTIC TRAITS**

- α) Characters that make or promote culture (“cultural hero” or “titan”)
- β) Inventions of a specific cultural level
- γ) They respectively have the gift of prophecy and cleromancy
- δ) They represent the Tyrant-Wise conflict
- ε) Their strength is knowledge, the *sophisma*

§5.- To grasp the true sense of Aeschylus’ *Palamedes* and *Prometheus*, there is nothing more interesting, in spite of the anachronism, than the study of Euripides’ *Palamedes*, which has reached us in many more fragments than that of the other two tragedy writers. In this work we immediately come across the ambiguous and ironic nature of his arguments.

As we see it, Palamedes represents the personification of the enlightened tendency whereas Ulysses and Agamemnon, who are his antagonists, represent demagogy, cruelty, cowardice, individualism and ambition for power. This is a pacifist Palamedes opposed to some “falcons” who take advantage of man’s credibility in order to destroy knowledge in times of war. Some scholars have even dared see in Ulysses an allusion to Alcibiades’ cruelty on the occasion of the “Sack of Melos”<sup>31</sup>. However, what Euripides proposed with his *Palamedes* is not just an apology of true enlightenment, or true rationalism, because we also find an ambiguous truth and a double meaning with regard to the “Justizmorde” or the innocent death of Palamedes. In effect, Euripides, who on the one hand defended moderate

---

<sup>31</sup> For example, see Delebecque 1951: 257, or Welcker 1839: 503-504.



rationality, confidence in the “Idea of progress” of Humanity in “anthropocentric optimism”, appears to be disappointed because that progress only led to contempt for intellectuals and even their exile or death. Therefore, Euripides’ *Palamedes* is one of the most symptomatic testimonies of the crisis of the “Idea of progress” in the classical Period, that is, an important crack in the progressive line, and this is reflected throughout the work in numerous places.

With regard to the fragmentary piece of *Palamedes*<sup>32</sup> by Euripides, and to the rest of the works which constitute the “Trojan Trilogy”, we must point out that they demonstrate the disenchantment and nihilism against the apparently “ascending” evolution and progress of Humanity and, simultaneously, a slight irony in the fact that the same “cultural heroes”, the “humanists” *avant la lettre*, are now “mis à mort” by men. A hero like Palamedes, πρῶτος εὐρετής or “first inventor”, who is based upon the *eikos* and truth and knowledge, is overthrown due to the lack of rationality in the world. In addition, it seems as if the homonymous work by the tragedy writer we are studying was tied to the application of sophistic principles (belief in the *physis* and its fatal end, the law of the strongest, etc.).

According to R. Scodel<sup>33</sup>, Palamedes seems “...unaware of the moral ambiguity of technical development”, that is to say, he is little aware of the moral ambiguity which every technological development entails. In the *Trojans* this idea of progress will lead to something close to madness, and will be treated with more irony in the satirical drama *Sisyphus*<sup>34</sup>, where “intelligence” is used as a synonym to “falsehood”, and where the power of the “false” (Ulysses) will become superior to the “knowledge” of the *sophos*.

Thus, we know that the mythical figure of Palamedes gained importance as a representative of the “Sophists” in detriment of Prometheus in the later literary tradition of Aeschylus. In the case of Sophocles’ *Palamedes*, who is not an analyzed man, is also proof in this sense. Therefore, what did two so similar people represent for Aeschylus in numerous mythemes? Can we perhaps say that the popular Indo-European hero Prometheus became confused with Palamedes? If we take into account that in Aeschylus’s *Palamedes* the number of inventions was much greater than in *Prometheus Bound*, as we have previously pointed out, then the appreciation

---

<sup>32</sup> *Palamedes* was a drama which took us to Troy, where Odysseus and Agamemnon managed to condemn to death this cultural and civilising hero, who invented writing, chance games, fire signals, etc. The mythical theme of the ambiguous need for writing is present throughout the piece, because our hero is betrayed through a false letter from Priam, and uses writing to tell his father Nauplius of his unjust death. The most interesting attempts to reconstruct this fragmentary piece belong to Szarmach 1975: 249-271. *Idem*, 1973: 281-287 or Romero 2007: 229-240.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Scodel 1980:116, as well our review (Clúa 1984: 149-150).

<sup>34</sup> With regard to the fragments and recent papyri of Euripides, we must point out the works of Austin 1968 and those of Seek 1981, which contains 844 fragments of identified pieces and 262 *incerti loci*.

by T.B.L. Webster<sup>35</sup> in the sense that Aeschylus's Palamedes was more interesting "I appointed army heads, and company commanders...."<sup>36</sup> (fr. 182 N<sup>2</sup>) is too partial and, therefore, without foundation. As we have seen before, it is true that Palamedes had little by little been attributed with all the discoveries that "one considered to be the donation of a divinity before".

**Compilation and translation of conserved fragments<sup>37</sup>  
of Aeschylus' *Palamedes***

fr. 181a (ΠΑΛΑΜΗΔΗΣ)  
ἔπειτα πάσης Ἑλλάδος καὶ ξυμμάχων  
βίον διώκησ' ὄντα πρὶν περὺρμένον  
θηρσὶν θ' ὅμοιον πρῶτα μὲν τὸν πάνσοφον  
ἀριθμὸν ἡῦρηκ' ἔξοχόν σοφισμάτων.

*Palamedes*: Then I organized the life of the whole of Greece  
and of its allies, which before had been without order, similar  
to beasts. First of all, I discovered the clever art of number,  
the most excellent of all insights.

fr. 181 (ΝΑΥΠΛΙΟΣ)  
τίνας κατέκτας ἔνεκα παῖδ' ἐμὸν βλάβης;

*Nauplios*: "For what reason of dishonor did you have to slew  
my son?"

fr. 182 (ΠΑΛΑΜΗΔΗΣ)  
καὶ ταξιάρχας χᾶκατοντάρχας στρατῷ  
ἔταξα, σῆτον δ' εἰδέναι διώρισα,  
ἄριστα, δεῖπνα δόρπα θ' αἶρεσθαι τρίτα

1 χᾶκ. στρατῷ Schweighaeuser : καὶ στρατάρχας  
καὶ ἑκατοντάρχας codd. Athenaei

*Palamedes*: And I appointed army heads, and company  
commanders.

I taught them to distinguish the food: to take breakfast, dinner and  
in third place supper.

---

<sup>35</sup> Webster 1967: 175.

<sup>36</sup> García Pérez 2009: 195-209.

<sup>37</sup> With "apparatus criticus" by Sommerstein 2000: 122-123.

fr. 182a, Σ Aesch. Prom. 457 (vel 458 vel 459): τούτων  
(M: ταύτην rell.) τὴν εὕρεσιν καὶ Παλαμῆδῃ προσήψεν

He [i. e. Aeschylus] has also ascribed the discovery of these things [or this discovery] to Palamedes.

[at 457 Prometheus begins a long enumeration of the discoveries he has made for mankind's benefit; 457–8 refers to astronomy and the seasons, 459–461 to number and writing].

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Austin, C. 1968: *Nova fragmenta euripidea in papyris reperta*, Berlin.
- Bérard, J. 1953: “Écriture pre-alphabétique et alphabet en Italie et dans les pays égeens”, *Minos* 2, pp. 65-83.
- Calderón, E. 2013: “El concepto de religión en Esquilo: reflexión terminológica”, *Emerita* 81, 2, pp. 295-313.
- Calderón, E. 2015: *Esquilo. Tragedias. V: Prometeo encadenado y fragmentos de otras tragedias sobre Prometeo*, Madrid.
- Charachidzé, G. 1986: *Prométhée ou le Caucase*, Paris.
- Clúa, J. A. 1985: “El mito de Palamedes a la Grècia antiga: aspectes canviants d’un interrogant cultural i historic”, *Faventia* 7, pp. 69-93.
- Clúa, J. A. 1988: Review of R. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*, col. “Hypomnemata”, 60, Göttingen, 1980, *Faventia* 10, 1, pp. 149-150.
- Clúa, J. A. - Montañés, R.J. 2013: *Esquilo. Persas, Siete contra Tebas, Suplicantes, Prometeo encadenado*, Madrid.
- Delcourt, M. 1965: “The Last Giants”, *History of Religions*, IV, 2, Chicago, pp. 209-242.
- Delebecque, E. 1951: *Euripide et la guerre du Peloponnèse*, Paris.
- Den Boer, W. 1977: *Progress in the Greece of Thucydides*, Amsterdam.
- Dodds, E.R. 1973: “The Prometheus vincitus and Scholarship”, included in *The ancient concept of Progress and other Essays on Greek Literature and Belief*, Oxford (reimp. 1985).
- Dodds, E. R. 1994: *Los griegos y lo irracional*, Madrid (University of California 1951).
- Durán López, M<sup>a</sup> Á. 2011: *Los dioses en crisis. Actitud de los sofistas ante la tendencia religiosa del hombre*, Madrid.
- Edelstein, L. 1967: *The Idea of Progress in Classical Antiquity*, Baltimore.
- García Gual, C. 1979: *Prometeo, mito y tragedia*, Madrid.
- García López, J. 1975: *La Religión Griega*, Madrid.
- García Pérez, D. 2009: “Prometeo encadenado: el conflicto entre política y religión”, *Teatro y sociedad en la Antigüedad Clásica. Legitimación e institucionalización política de la violencia* (eds. F. de Martino - C. Morenilla), Bari, pp. 195-209.

- Graves, R. 1967: *Los Mitos griegos*, Buenos Aires.
- Griffith, M. 1983: *Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound*, Cambridge.
- Grube, G.M.A. 1970: "Zeus in Aeschylus", *AJPh* 91, pp. 43-51.
- Guthrie, W. K.C. 1971: *The Sophists*, London.
- Jahn, O. 1836: *Palamedes*, Hamburg.
- Kérenyi, K. 1946: *Prometheus. Die menschliche Existenz in Griechischer Deutung*, New York (r. 1959).
- Kérenyi, K. 1997: *Prometheus: Archetypal Image of Human Existence*, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Kleingunther, A. 1933: Πρῶτος εὐρετής. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung*, Philol. Suppl. B, 26, I, Berlin.
- Librán, M. 2005: *Lonjas del banquete de Homero. Convenciones dramáticas en la tragedia temprana de Esquilo*, Huelva.
- Longo, O. 1961-1962: "Il significato politico del Prometeo di Eschilo", *Atti Ist. Veneto* 120, pp. 249-252.
- Lucas de Dios, J.-M<sup>a</sup> 2008: *Esquilo. Fragmentos. Testimonios*, Madrid.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1971: *The Justice of Zeus*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London.
- Mette, A.J. 1959: *Die Fragmente der Tragoedien des Aischylos*, Berlin.
- Mondolfo, R. 1955: "La creatividad del espíritu y la idea del progreso en el pensamiento clásico", in *La comprensión del sujeto humano en la cultura Antigua*, Buenos Aires, pp. 509-607.
- Nestle, W. 1940: *Vom Mythos zum Logos*, Stuttgart.
- Phillips, E. D. 1957: "A suggestion about Palamedes", *AJPh* 78, pp. 267-278.
- Preller-Robert, C. 1921: *Griechische Heldensage*, II, Berlin, 1127.
- Romero Mariscal, L. 2003: *Estudio sobre el léxico político de las tragedias de Eurípides: La trilogía troyana de 415 a.C., II: Textos: Las tragedias fragmentarias de la Trilogía de 415. Alejandro, Apéndice I. Esquilo y las tragedias de tema troyano*. Diss. Granada.
- Romero Mariscal, L. 2007: "El prólogo del *Palamedes* de Eurípides", *Lexis* 25, pp. 229-240.
- Schmid, W. 1929: *Untersuchungen zum gefesselten Prometheus*, Stuttgart.
- Scodel, R. 1980: *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*, col. "Hypomnemata", 60, Göttingen.
- Séchan, L. 1951: *Le mythe de Prométhée*, Paris.
- Seek, G. A. 1981: *Euripides. Fragmenta*, München.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2000: "The prologue of Aeschylus' *Palamedes*", *RhM* 143, 2, pp. 118-127.
- Sommerstein, A. H., 2008: *Aeschylus, III, Fragments*, Cambridge, MA - London.
- Sommerstein, A.H. & Talboy, T.H. (eds.) 2012: *Edition with introduction, translation and commentary of Sophocles's Selected fragmentary plays. Sophocles, Selected fragmentary plays. Volume II, The Epigoni, Oenomaus, Palamedes, The arrival of Nauplius, Nauplius and the beacon, The shepherds, Triptolemus*, Oxford.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2010: *The Tangled Ways of Zeus and Other Studies*, Oxford.
- Stoessl, F. 1966: "Die *Palamedes*-Tragoedien der drei grossen Tragiker und das Problem des Hypothesis", *WS* 79, pp. 93-101.
- Szarmach, M. 1973: "Essai de reconstitution du *Palamède* d'Euripide", *Meander* 28, pp. 281-287.

- Szarmach, M. 1974: "Les tragédies d'Eschyle et de Sophocle sur Palamède", *Eos* 62, pp. 193-204.
- Szarmach, M. 1975: "Le Palamède d'Euripide", *Eos* 63, pp. 249-271.
- Thomson, G. 1946: *Aeschylus and Athens*, London.
- Trousson, R. 2001: *Le thème de Prométhée dans la littérature européenne*, Genève.
- Wachsmuth, C. 1958: *Joannis Stobaei Anthologium*, I, Berlin.
- Webster, T. B. L. 1967: *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London.
- Welcker, F. G. 1839: *Die griechische Tragoedie*, Bonn.
- Wilamowitz, U.v. 1914: *Aischylos Interpretationen*, Berlin.
- Wilamowitz, U.v. 1935: *Kleine Schriften*, I, Berlin.